

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of July 11, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-10, 12, 16, 20, 22-25 and 27-28 are amended, and claims 2, 11 and 26 are cancelled. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found at least from cancelled claim 2 and page 32, line 32—page 33, line 29. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections Under § 101

On page 2 of the Office action claims 10, 11 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The preambles of claims 10 and 24-25 are amended as suggested by the Office, and therefore applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 101 rejection to these claims. Claims 11 and 26 are cancelled, and therefore the rejection is considered moot in view of the cancellation of the claims. Claim 27 is not directed to a computer readable medium, but is instead directed to a module including the components recited in claim 27. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 27 is statutory since it is directed to a product.

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 5, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-16 and 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Setogawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,024). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa, because Setogawa fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to recite that each of the groups of pictures includes a video sequence ID separate from the picture ID for the encoded pictures. Furthermore, claim 1 recites that the video sequence ID is the same for each picture in the same group of pictures, and the video sequence ID can be used for determining which pictures belong to the same group of pictures. Setogawa at least fails to disclose or suggest these limitations of claim 1, and therefore applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1.

Setogawa is related to an image data processing method and a signal processing method for coding a picture sequence including I-pictures, P-pictures and B-pictures accommodated in groups of pictures (GOPs). When the pictures of a certain GOP among a series of GOP's are changed, the coding is performed replacing the first picture of the sequence of the changed pictures of the GOP with an I-picture of a picture number prescribed in accordance with the position of change, so that coding is possible without existence of a picture in the preceding GOP.

Setogawa shows in Figures 6A-6C a diagram of the configuration of a bit stream of the MPEG standard showing the configuration of a GOP, and the contents of the GOP header and picture header. Figure 6C shows that the picture header includes a temporal reference that includes the order of display of images in a GOP. However, in contrast to claim 1, Setogawa does not disclose or suggest a video sequence ID that is separate from the picture ID, and the video sequence ID is the same for each picture in the same GOP. Instead, Setogawa only shows that the GOP header includes a group start code, time code, closed GOP and broken link. None of these information elements correspond to the video sequence ID as recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa, and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1.

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1, and therefore is not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa at least in view of its dependency. In addition, Setogawa also fails to disclose or suggest that different video sequence IDs are defined for two or more groups of pictures. Figures 6A and 6B only show one common sequence header for all of the groups of pictures in the same sequence. Therefore, Setogawa does not disclose or suggest that different video sequence IDs are defined for two or more groups of pictures.

Claim 4 ultimately depends from independent claim 1, and therefore is not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa at least in view of its dependency. In addition, Setogawa also fails to disclose or suggest that the decoding order of pictures is determined according to the video sequence ID. As discussed above, the sequence header is common to all of the GOPs, and therefore if all of the GOPs have the same sequence header it is not possible to determine the order of pictures according to the sequence header.

Claim 5 ultimately depends from independent claim 1, and therefore is not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa at least in view of its dependency. In addition, Setogawa also fails to disclose or suggest that the decoding order of the video sequence IDs are transmitted on a transmission layer, and the picture IDs are transmitted on a video layer, because there is only one video sequence ID discussed in Setogawa for one sequence of pictures. Therefore, it is not possible to transmit separate video sequence IDs on separate layers, because separate video sequence IDs are not disclosed in Setogawa.

Independent claims 6, 8-10, 12, 16, 20, 22-25 and 27-28 are amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and therefore for at least for the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, these independent claims are not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa.

The claims depending from the independent claims listed above are also not disclosed or suggested by Setogawa at least in view of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 8, on page 8 of the Office Action, claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Setogawa in view of Bigham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,677,905). Claims 17 and 19 ultimately depend from independent claim 16, and Bigham fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Setogawa identified above. Therefore, claims 17 and 19 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 9, on page 9 of the Office Action, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Setogawa in view of Watkins (U.S. Publ. Appl. No. 2004/0039796). Claim 18 ultimately depends from independent claim 16, and Watkins fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Setogawa identified above. Therefore, claim 18 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11 October 2007

Keith R. Obert

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955